

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/349,676	07/08/1999	KRISTEN DIANE ONDECK	PHA-23.681	6934
75	590 11/22/2002			
Corporate Patent Counsel Philips Electronics North America Corporation 580 White Plains Road			EXAMINER	
			JANVIER, JEAN D	
TARRYTOWN	, NY 10591		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3622	
			DATE MAIL ED: 11/22/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-4	Application No.	Applicant(s)	h				
Advisory Action	09/349,676	ONDECK, KRISTEN	DIANE				
	Examiner	Art Unit					
The MAIL INC DATE of this communication and	Jean D Janvier	3622					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 08 November 2002 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the same of this application at the same of the sam	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	to a tion in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP				
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the second of the control	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate or the final (opriate extension Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .							
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· <i>· ·</i> —	· 	nd an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is			ner.				
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer Other:	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	- Evil	parrise				
		ERIC W. S					
		SUPERVISORY PA TECHNOLOGY					
Y			J				

Continuation of 2. NOTE: "enabling the provider to determine with the retailer a customization procedure to be carried out after a sale of the product" is a newly added limitation that was not part of the claimed invention.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the argument that the prior art fails to disclose "that the electronic device is customized with information specific to the retailer based on the determined customization procedure" is based solely on the newly added limitation of claim 1.

BUT ENENTERED

2